

REMARKS

Please reconsider the claims in the application in view of the remarks below. In the present application, claims 1-14 remain pending.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to claim 12 because of an informality. Claim 12 is being amended as suggested in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art ("APA") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,792,431 to Tamboli et al. ("Tamboli"). The Office Action also rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over APA in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,941,326 to Kadyk. ("Kadyk").

In this reply, independent claims 1, 6, 7, 11 and 12 are being amended to clarify that a view display module updates the changed portion of the view. Support for the amendment can be found on page 17 (fifth paragraph) and page 18. Applicant believes that the cited references in combination, or individually, do not disclose or suggest or teach at least this element.

For example, APA discloses a shortcoming of an existing model that converts the entire source model into a target model and recreates a view that is based on the new converted model. Tamboli discloses a method of creating a system implementing a dynamic common model for integrating data. The subject matter with which Tamboli is concerned is database repositories, not views. Similarly, Kadyk appears to disclose synchronizing and updating data. However, Kadyk also is not concerned with views.

The claims in the present application recite methods in several embodiments that overcome the shortcomings of those existing possible techniques discussed in the background section of the present application, that is, those techniques that display different views when there are no interfaces for providing the desired view for that particular application. The claims in the present application are directed to displaying and updating a view to an application model where there is no interface for displaying the application model in that particular view.

Thus, contrary to the allegation in the Office Action, APA, Tamboli and Kadyk do not disclose, suggest or teach every element claimed in independent claims. Claims 2-5, 8-10, and 13-14, which depend directly from the independent claims incorporate all of the limitations the corresponding independent claim and also are not obvious over APA and Tamboli or Kadyk for at least those reasons provided for claims 1, 6, 7, 11 and 12.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite prosecution of this case, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call applicant's attorney at (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven Fischman
Registration No.: 34,594

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, N.Y. 11530
(516) 742-4343
SF:EP:me